

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED  
JAN 29 1998  
FCC

In the Matters of	)	NSD File No. L-98-03
	)	
Implementation of the Local	)	CC Docket No. 96-98
Competition Provisions of the	)	
Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	
	)	
Interconnection Between Local	)	CC Docket No. 95-185
Exchange Carriers and Commercial	)	
Mobile Radio Service Providers	)	
	)	
Area Code Relief Plan for Dallas	)	NSD File No. 96-8
and Houston, Ordered by the Public	)	
Utility Commission of Texas	)	
	)	
Administration of the North	)	CC Docket No. 92-237
American Numbering Plan	)	
	)	
Proposed 708 Relief Plan and 630	)	IAD File No. 94-102
Numbering Plan Area Code and	)	
Ameritech-Illinois	)	

**NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE  
REPLY COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PETITION  
FOR WAIVER OF 47 C.F.R. 52.19(c) (3) (ii)**

FILED BY  
THE NEW YORK STATE  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE

Dated: January 28, 1998  
Albany, New York

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matters of	)	NSD File No. L-98-03
	)	
Implementation of the Local	)	CC Docket No. 96-98
Competition Provisions of the	)	
Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	
	)	
Interconnection Between Local	)	CC Docket No. 95-185
Exchange Carriers and Commercial	)	
Mobile Radio Service Providers	)	
	)	
Area Code Relief Plan for Dallas	)	NSD File No. 96-8
and Houston, Ordered by the Public	)	
Utility Commission of Texas	)	
	)	
Administration of the North	)	CC Docket No. 92-237
American Numbering Plan	)	
	)	
Proposed 708 Relief Plan and 630	)	IAD File No. 94-102
Numbering Plan Area Code and	)	
Ameritech-Illinois	)	

NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE  
REPLY COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PETITION  
FOR WAIVER OF 47 C.F.R. 52.19(c)(3)(ii)

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

With two exceptions, all commenters, including the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio and industry (Bell Atlantic, RCN Communications and SBC Companies [Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, Pacific Telephone and Nevada Telephone]), have supported the New York Department of Public Service (NYDPS) Petition for Expedited Waiver of 47 C.F.R. 52.19(c)(3)(ii) (Waiver Petition). Only MCI Telecommunications Corporation (MCI) and WinStar Communications, Inc., (WinStar) have filed comments in

opposition.<sup>1</sup>

MCI and WinStar contend that an area code overlay cannot be implemented in a competitively neutral manner unless there is also 10-digit dialing. As discussed below, CLECs are currently assigned over one million numbers in Manhattan but are using only about 15%, or 150,000. For this and various other reasons addressed below, and in the Waiver Petition, there is absolutely no question that the unique circumstances in New York City will allow all local exchange carriers to compete, unfettered, in an area code overlay with 7-digit dialing.

#### DISCUSSION

MCI and WinStar make three basic arguments that the NYDPS Waiver Petition should be denied: (1) the Commission denied a similar waiver request by Pennsylvania (MCI p. 4,7); (2) any relaxation of the 10-digit dialing requirement in an area code overlay will impose technical constraints on some new market entrants (WinStar p. 4-5); and (3) the imposition of the 10-digit dialing requirement is necessary to avoid alleged anti-competitive effects of an area code overlay (MCI p. 4-8 and WinStar p. 5-8). Each of these contentions is either without merit or incorrect.

---

<sup>1</sup> MCI opposes the request for waiver of the Commission's 10-digit dialing requirement but agrees that expedited action on the NYDPS petition is warranted. WinStar supports the area code overlay but believes 10-digit dialing is necessary when an overlay is used.

## POINT I

### MCI AND WINSTAR HAVE FAILED TO ANSWER THE NYDPS SHOWING THAT CIRCUMSTANCES IN NEW YORK CITY DIFFER MARKEDLY FROM THOSE IN PENNSYLVANIA

The NYDPS Waiver Petition demonstrated that the vastly differing number of rate centers between New York and Pennsylvania, the vastly different number utilization rates between CLECs and the ILEC in New York and the existence of permanent local number portability before activation of new overlay area code(s) and imminent availability of number pooling in New York sharply distinguished New York from Pennsylvania (Waiver Petition p. 4-7). Neither WinStar nor MCI has refuted these facts. Specifically, they have not answered the fact that there are only three rate centers in Manhattan compared to approximately 100 rate centers in the Pittsburgh metro area which were the subject of the Pennsylvania petition. As pointed out in the Waiver Petition (at 6), the small number of rate centers in Manhattan allows all competitors to obtain central office codes in all rate centers.

Secondly, MCI and WinStar have not responded to the fact that the CLECs in New York only utilize 15% of the numbers already assigned to them while the ILEC has used 80% of its assigned numbers. In Pennsylvania there was no showing that the CLECs had a significant amount of numbers available to them in the existing area code.

Third, MCI and WinStar have failed to refute the positive pro-competitive implications of the fact that New York has required permanent local number portability prior to activation of the new area code overlay. Pennsylvania had only

interim number portability available at the time of its waiver request.

Finally, the opposition failed to refute the significance of the fact that number pooling is expected to be implemented as soon as it becomes technically feasible. In contrast, number pooling was not part of the Pennsylvania plan (NYDPS Waiver Petition, 5-7). Therefore, the Commission's decision in Pennsylvania certainly should not be controlling for New York.

#### POINT II

##### THE TECHNICAL CONSTRAINTS ALLEGED BY WINSTAR ARE NOT RELEVANT TO WHETHER AN OVERLAY SHOULD REQUIRE 10-DIGIT DIALING

WinStar claims that 10-digit dialing should be required because "end user PBX and Key Telephone Systems, particularly those with call accounting capability are not capable under current software releases ... of supporting this new format (WinStar p. 4)." A certain level of software or system modification is often required, irrespective of the number of digits dialed, whenever a new area code is activated. In contrast, under a 10-digit home NPA dialing requirement, immediate and additional reprogramming of vintage PBXs and Key Telephone Systems would be necessary to implement 10-digit dialing.<sup>2</sup> Such additional reprogramming is not required under a

---

<sup>2</sup> In the five to six years since the adoption of the 917 predominantly wireless overlay there is no evidence that 7-digit dialing created any technical problems for wireless or wireline carriers.

7-digit home NPA dialing plan. WinStar's argument, therefore, is nothing more than a red herring.

### POINT III

#### ALTHOUGH TEN-DIGIT DIALING IN NEW YORK CITY WILL HARM CUSTOMERS, IT WILL NOT BENEFIT COMPETITION

MCI concedes that mandatory 10-digit dialing will create significant discomfort and confusion (MCI p. 2). In fact, during the course of an extensive public involvement process customers overwhelmingly favored an area code overlay without 10-digit dialing. Nonetheless, MCI and WinStar claim there should be 10-digit dialing because it will ameliorate potential anti-competitive effects of an area code overlay. They are incorrect for several reasons.

First, CLECs collectively have available approximately 85% of the numbers assigned to them for use by new customers in the 212 area code. It is unlikely, therefore, that any CLEC will be competitively disadvantaged in attracting customers who desire telephone numbers in the 212 area code. As a matter of fact, the CLECs' markets can grow by more than 500% within the 212 area code without the CLECs needing to resort to number portability or number pooling. In contrast, the ILEC's market can only grow by less than 25% within the 212 area code. There is no competitive disadvantage to the CLECs in Manhattan.

Second, MCI's claims regarding number portability and number pooling are factually unfounded and illogical (MCI p. 4-7). Once again, MCI's claims are based on the incorrect assumption that new market entrants will be exclusively served by

the new area code. Given the number utilization rate for the ILEC in comparison to the number utilization rate for the CLECs, the new area code is more likely to serve ILEC customers than CLEC customers.<sup>3</sup> In fact, WinStar concedes that number portability significantly advances the Commission's and the NYDPS's pro-competitive policies (WinStar p. 6).<sup>4</sup>

Third, MCI assumes, without support, that it will be unable to attract ILEC customers without the customer first testing its service (MCI p. 5). There is no basis for this claim if MCI offers a competitive service. However, even if customers prefer to test a new market entrant's services by augmenting their existing service with additional lines from the new market entrant, as MCI claims, MCI and the other CLECs have a significant percentage of unused numbers in the existing area code. With these unused numbers, coupled with permanent number portability and number pooling, CLECs can permit customers to test their services using existing NPAs and NXXs.

Fourth, MCI argues that number pooling will not further the pro-competitive policies advanced by the Commission and the

---

<sup>3</sup> WinStar mischaracterizes the NYDPS position as suggesting that the ILEC "does not have an overwhelming presence in the 212 NPA" (WinStar p. 5). That presence would exist in any industry that changes from a regulated monopoly environment to a competitive market environment.

<sup>4</sup> WinStar argues that permanent number portability is only available in two of the three rate centers and therefore is not available on a widespread basis (WinStar p. 6). Its claim simply is incorrect. Permanent local number portability will be available throughout New York City by March 31, 1998 with the exception of three central offices (Belle Harbor, Far Rockaway and Kingsbridge Ave.) where number portability is scheduled to become available by April 30, 1998. These dates are well before the scheduled implementation of the overlay for these areas.

NYDPS. Again, this claim ignores the CLEC utilization rate in New York City.<sup>5</sup> Further, if the CLECs actually require additional numbers, number assignments in blocks of 1,000 instead of 10,000 will satisfy their demand.<sup>6</sup> MCI concedes that if the plan in New York includes all unassigned numbers<sup>7</sup> in the pool and make them available to all carriers, it will ensure equal access to number resources (MCI p. 6).<sup>8</sup>

Finally, MCI claims that the non-discriminatory application of the central office code assignment guidelines does not mitigate the anti-competitive effects of an area code overlay without 10-digit dialing (MCI p. 7). This position is incorrect inasmuch as the importance of fair number assignment to ensuring equal access to number resources is self evident. To suggest otherwise ignores the significance of the conditions proposed for

---

<sup>5</sup> MCI's assertion that there are "precious few numbers" available for pooling in the 212" area code is incorrect. There are approximately two million more numbers available in the 212 NPA. A majority of these numbers are poolable based on the guidelines being developed with the industry.

<sup>6</sup> MCI notes the anticipated June 1998 exhaust date for the 212 area code (MCI p. 6). The NYDPS and industry have developed a plan to conserve central code assignments to avoid exhaust in advance of the activation of the new area code. An extraordinary jeopardy rationing plan developed by the industry is now in place in Manhattan. Only three NXXs per month are now being assigned to carriers.

<sup>7</sup> These unassigned poolable numbers include unassigned NXXs, all uncontaminated 1,000 number blocks in assigned NXXs and all 1,000 number blocks with less than 10% contamination in assigned NXXs.

<sup>8</sup> Contrary to most thinking in the industry, WinStar believes that number pooling is a "competitive disadvantage" (p. 7). It claims that number pooling reduces the level of "vanity numbers" available. Such an argument cannot justify inconveniencing millions of customers.



the New York City overlay, including permanent number portability and number pooling.

CONCLUSION

Under a permissive -- as opposed to mandatory -- 10-digit dialing approach, customers would have the option of dialing seven or ten digits for intraNPA calls, and each could choose the method that was most convenient and/or least confusing. Competition is all about customer choice, and there is no reason to limit that choice here. For all the reasons stated herein, the comments in opposition to the NYDPS Waiver Petition should be rejected.

Lawrence G. Malone  
General Counsel  
Public Service Commission  
of the State of New York  
Three Empire State Plaza  
Albany, New York 12223-1350  
(518) 474-2510

Of Counsel

Cheryl L. Callahan  
Assistant Counsel

Dated: January 28, 1998  
Albany, New York

CC Docket No. 96-98	In the Matters of Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996
CC Docket No. 95-185	Interconnection Between Local Exchange Carriers and Commercial Mobil Radio Service Providers
NSD File No. 96-8	Area Code Relief Plan for Dallas and Houston, Ordered by the Public Utility Commission of Texas
CC Docket No. 92-237	Administration of the North American Numbering Plan
IAD File No. 94-102	Proposed 708 Relief Plan and 630 Numbering Plan Area Code and Ameritech-Illinois

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Cheryl L. Callahan, hereby certify that an original and eleven copies of the Reply Comments in Support of Petition for Waiver of 47 C.F.R. 52.19(c)(3)(ii) filed by the New York State Department of Public Service was hand delivered to Ms. Magalie Roman Galas. Copies were sent by First Class United States Mail, postage prepaid, to all parties on the attached service list.



Cheryl L. Callahan  
Assistant Counsel  
Office of General Counsel  
NYS Department of Public Service  
Three Empire State Plaza  
Albany, New York 12223-1350  
(518) 474-6513

Dated: January 28, 1998  
Albany, New York

James Lanni  
Rhode Island Division  
of Public Utilities  
100 Orange Street  
Providence RI 02903

Joel B. Shifman  
Maine Public Utility Commission  
State House Station 18  
Augusta ME 04865

Charles F. Larken  
Vermont Department of  
Public Service  
120 State Street  
Montpelier VT 05602

Rita Barmen  
Vermont Public Service Board  
89 Main Street  
Montpelier VT 05602

Keikki Leesment  
New Jersey Board of  
Public Utilities  
2 Gateway Center  
Newark NJ 07102

Veronica A. Smith  
Deputy Chief Counsel  
Pennsylvania Public Utility  
Commission  
P.O. Box 3265  
Harrisburg PA 17105-3265

Mary J. Sisak  
District of Columbia  
Public Service Commission  
Suite 800  
450 Fifth Street  
Washington DC 20001

Telecommunications Report  
1333 H Street, N.W. - 11th Floor  
West Tower  
Washington DC 20005

International Transcription  
Services, Inc.  
1231 20th Street  
Washington DC 20036

Brad Ramsay  
NARUC  
Interstate Commerce  
Commission Bldg., Room 1102  
12th & Constitution St., NW  
Washington DC 20044

Magalie Roman Salas  
Secretary  
Room 222  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW  
Washington DC 20554

Richard Metzger, Chief  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW  
Washington DC 20554

Camille Stonehill  
State Telephone Regulation  
Report  
1101 King Street  
Suite 444  
Alexandria VA 22314

Alabama Public Service  
Commission  
1 Court Square  
Suite 117  
Montgomery AL 36104

Archie R. Hickerson  
Tennessee Public Service  
Commission  
460 James Robertson Pky.  
Nashville TN 37219

Sandy Ibaugh  
Indiana Utility  
Regulatory Commission  
901 State Office Bldg.  
Indianapolis IN 46204

Ronald Choura  
Michigan Public  
Service Commission  
6545 Mercantile Way  
Lansing MI 48910

Mary Street  
Iowa Utilities Board  
Lucas Building  
5th Floor  
Des Moines IA 50316

Gary Evenson  
Wisconsin Public  
Service Commission  
P.O. Box 7854  
Madison WI 53707

Gordon L. Persinger  
Missouri Public Service  
Commission  
P.O. Box 360  
Jefferson City MO 65102

Sam Loudenslager  
Arkansas Public Service  
Commission  
1200 Center Street  
P.O. Box C-400  
Little Rock AR 72203

Maribeth D. Swapp  
Deputy General Counsel  
Oklahoma Corp. Commission  
400 Jim Thorpe Building  
Oklahoma City OK 73105

Marsha H. Smith  
Idaho Public Utilities  
Commission  
Statehouse  
Boise ID 83720

Edward Morrison  
Oregon Public Utilities  
Commission  
Labor and Industries Bldg.  
Room 330  
Salem OR 97310

Mary Adu  
Public Utilities Commission of the  
State of California  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco CA 94102

Rob Vandiver  
General Counsel  
Florida Public Service  
Commission  
101 East Gaines Street  
Tallahassee FL 32301

Glenn Blackmon  
Washington U&TC  
1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr., S.W.  
P.O. Box 47250  
Olympia WA 98504-7250

Policy and Planning Division  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W. - Room 544  
Washington DC 20554

Myra Karegianes  
General Counsel  
Illinois Commerce Commission  
State of Illinois Building  
160 No. LaSalle - Suite C-800  
Chicago IL 60601-3104

Margie Hendrickson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Manager, Public Utilities Division  
121 7th Place East, Suite 350  
St. Paul MN 55101

Robin McHugh  
Montana PSC  
1701 Prospect Avenue  
P.O. Box 202601  
Helena MT 59620-2601

Cynthia Norwood  
Virginia State Corp. Commission  
P.O. Box 1197  
Richmond VA 23201

Deonne Brunning  
Nebraska PSC  
1200 N. Street  
Lincoln NE 68508

Wanda Harris  
Common Carrier Bureau  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Room 518  
Washington DC 20554

Diane Munns  
Iowa Utilities Board  
Lucas State Office Building  
Des Moines, IA 50319

H. Russell Frisby, Jr.  
Chairman  
Maryland Public Service Commission  
6 St. Paul Street  
16th Floor  
Baltimore, MD 21202-6806

Geraldine Matise, Chief  
Network Services Division  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

John M. Goodman  
Attorney for Bell Atlantic  
1300 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Russell M. Blau  
Morton J. Posner  
Swidler & Berlin, Chtd.  
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20007

Jutta Martin  
Assistant Attorney General  
Public Utilities Section  
180 E. Broad Street, 7th Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Robert M. Lynch  
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company  
One Bell Plaza, Room 3703  
Dallas, Texas 75202

Daniel F. Gonos  
Senior Manager  
Numbering Policy and Resources  
WinStar Communications, Inc.  
6878 Cedarbrook  
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48301